

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 19-36 are now pending in this application, claims 1-18 having been cancelled and new claims 21-36 having been added by the present Amendment.

It is noted that new claims 21-27 correspond to current claims 2-5 and 7-9, respectively, rewritten to depend from claim 19. Further, new claims 28-34 correspond to current claims 11-14 and 16-18, respectively, rewritten to depend from claim 20.

The applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to applicants' representative during the telephonic interview conducted on February 22, 2006. During the course of the interview, various options for amending the claims to place this application in condition for allowance were discussed. More particularly, one proposed amendment that was discussed involved amending claim 19 (and claim 20 in a similar manner) to recite "receiving a user ID from the client terminal, and sending to the client terminal a predetermined number of most recently used printing agent printer sites selected in the past by the user indicated by the user ID; selecting a printer agent printing site from the predetermined number of most recently used printing agent printer sites; and printing the print data at the selected printer agent printing site when a client who has sent said print request instructs printout at the selected printing agent printer site." The Examiner indicated that this proposed amendment appeared to distinguish over the currently cited prior art.

As discussed in more detail below, the present claim amendments amend the claims to add features that the Examiner indicated appeared to distinguish over the presently cited prior art.

**Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

In the Final Office Action dated November 30, 2005, the claims were rejected as follows:

Claims 1-4 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanaka** (USP 6,522,971) in view of **Britt** (USP 6,647,267).

Claims 5 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanaka** and **Britt** as applied to claims 1 and 10, and further in view of **Minari** (USP 6,809,831).

Claims 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanaka** and **Britt** as applied to claims 1 and 10, and further in view of **Fritsch** (USP 6,247,130).

Claims 7 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanaka**, **Britt**, and **Minari** as applied to claims 1, 5, 10 and 14, and further in view of **Kawai et al.** (USP 6,404,994).

Claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Takana** and **Britt** as applied to claims 1 and 10, and further in view of **Hanzawa** (USP 5,506,661).

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanaka** in view of **Fritsch**.

Claims 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanaka** and **Britt** as applied to claims 1 and 10, and further in view of **Satomi et al.** (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0039641).

For the reasons set forth in detail below, it is submitted that the presently amended claims patentably distinguish over the previously cited prior art.

Initially, it is submitted that the rejections of claims 1-18 are rendered moot in view of the cancellation of these claims.

Claims 19-20 were rejected over **Tanaka** in view of **Fritsch**. Claims 19-20 have been amended to clarify that a predetermined number of most recently used printing agent printer sites received by a user indicated by a user ID are sent to the client terminal. Support for these amendments is provided, e.g., in the application specification, Fig. 14, Step S33 and accompanying description.

The Office Action recognizes that **Tanaka** does not specifically teach a server that receives a user ID from a client terminal and sends to the client terminal the printer agent printer site selected in the past by the user indicated by the user ID (see Office Action, page 11, lines 15-16). The Office Action relies on **Fritsch** for disclosure of the features missing from **Tanaka**. **Fritsch** discloses a system for distributing musical products via a website vendor over the internet. The system includes history software that stores information for *all previous sales activity*. After a PC user's log-in, the history software accesses the database storing information for all previous sales activity, and selects and displays those records pertaining to the PC user's purchases (see column 6, lines 49-61).

However, **Fritsch** sends a list of purchases to the PC user. **Fritsch** does not disclose or suggest sending to the client terminal *a predetermined number of most recently used* printing agent printer sites selected by a user indicated by the user ID. In contrast, **Fritsch** discloses simply sending a list of *all* previous purchases to a user. Moreover, **Fritsch** is silent with respect to most recently used purchases. **Fritsch** simply indicates that previous tracks and/or albums that

have been purchased are listed (col. 6, lines 59-61) and is silent regarding which tracks or albums have been most recently purchased.

Further, amended claim 19 (and similarly claim 20) recites “receiving a selected printer agent printing site from the predetermined number of most recently used printing agent printer sites” and “printing... at the selected printer agent printing site....” **Fritsch** is silent with respect to selecting from the list of purchases.

Furthermore, it is submitted that the concept of a presenting a user with a list of all purchases is fundamentally different from presenting a user with a list of a predetermined number of most recently used printer sites in that the list of purchases is indicative of things that will likely not be selected again because a user has already purchased an item, while the printer sites provide a service that will most likely be used (i.e., selected) again.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 19-20, and claims 21-34 which depend from claim 19 or 20, patentably distinguish over the cited prior art and define allowable subject matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19-20 are respectfully requested.

#### **New Claims**

New claims 35-36 have been added by the present amendment. New claims 35 and 36 include features similar to those pointed out above that patentably distinguish claims 19 and 20 over the cited prior art. It is believed that new claims 35 and 36 are allowable for reasons that are the same as or similar to those pointed out above with respect to claims 19 and 20.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection and an indication of allowability of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William M. Schertler", is written over the printed name.

William M. Schertler  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 35,348  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

WMS/rf